

Significant Analysis for Rule Concerning
New Section - WAC 246-853-085 Approved colleges and schools of
osteopathic medicine and surgery

Briefly describe the proposed rule.

The proposed rule identifies that the Board for licensure of osteopathic physicians approves colleges or schools of osteopathic medicine accredited by the American Osteopathic Association Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation. The Board currently has a policy which identifies graduation from colleges accredited by the American Osteopathic Association Commission on Osteopathic College Accreditation as meeting the requirement for licensure.

Is a Significant Analysis required for this rule?

Yes. DOH has reviewed this proposal and has determined a Significant Analysis is required because an applicant will need a diploma from a board approved school to be licensed. Applicants will be required to meet the standard specified by the WAC.

A. Clearly state in detail the general goals and specific objectives of the statute that the rule implements.

RCW 18.57.020 provides that applicants for licensure must provide the board evidence that a diploma has been issued by an accredited school of osteopathic medicine and surgery, approved by the board. The proposed rule outlines which schools of osteopathic medicine and surgery will be approved.

B. Determine that the rule is needed to achieve these goals and objectives, and analyze alternatives to rulemaking and the consequences of not adopting the rule.

The current statute simply states that the Board must approve schools for applicants. The board's policy specifies that accredited schools are those approved for licensure. In recent years there has been an increase in new osteopathic colleges. However, the new programs remain on probationary status until graduation of their first class. If one of the programs does not complete the accreditation process the policy could be challenged by students of that program. Currently there are not enforceable standards that identify approved schools. To ensure consistency and provide clear and enforceable standards rules must be adopted.

C. Determine that the probable benefits of the rule are greater than its probable costs, taking into account both the qualitative and quantitative benefits and costs and the specific directives of the statute being implemented.

The proposed rule specifies approved schools of osteopathic medicine and surgery are those accredited by the American Osteopathic Association Commission on Osteopathic

College Accreditation. Currently it is the board's policy that osteopathic schools accredited by this agency meet the requirements for licensure.

There are no additional costs because the requirements do not change as a result of the proposed rule. The proposed rule provides clear and enforceable standards for school approval.

D. Determine, after considering alternative versions of the rule, that the rule being adopted is the least burdensome alternative for those required to comply with it that will achieve the general goals and specific objectives stated previously.

There was no alternative version because there is only one accrediting agency for schools of osteopathic medicine. It is not recommended to list standards in rules because they require close monitoring to ensure that the standards stay current. If they change, it would require rulemaking each time a change occurs. A possible alternative would be for the Board to set its own standards and process for approval of schools. However, this would be duplication of efforts and costly for both the Board and the schools. The proposed rule is the least burdensome for those required to comply with it.

E. Determine that the rule does not require those to whom it applies to take an action that violates requirements of another federal or state law.

The rule does not require those to whom it applies to take an action that violates requirements of federal or state law.

F. Determine that the rule does not impose more stringent performance requirements on private entities than on public entities unless required to do so by federal or state law.

The rule does not impose more stringent performance requirements on private entities than on public entities.

G. Determine if the rule differs from any federal regulation or statute applicable to the same activity or subject matter and, if so, determine that the difference is justified by an explicit state statute or by substantial evidence that the difference is necessary.

The rule does not differ from any applicable federal regulation or statute.

H. Demonstrate that the rule has been coordinated, to the maximum extent practicable, with other federal, state, and local laws applicable to the same activity or subject matter.

There are no other applicable laws.